

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 27-28, 31-34, 36 and 38-39 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 are withdrawn. Claims 23-26, 29-30, 35 and 37 are herein canceled. Claims 38 and 39 are herein added. Claims 27-28, 31-34 and 36 are herein amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the Title of the Application to make the Title descriptive as requested by the Examiner. Applicant has also amended the Abstract section to conform the Abstract section to a Method as identified by the Examiner. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 23-26 have been canceled herein rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 23-26 moot. Claim 27 has been amended herein to add the limitation of "unitary" masses and to depend from new Claim 38. Claim 38 is believed to be in allowable form. Claim 27 is also submitted to be in allowable form. The

Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claim 27.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 23-25, 28 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,311,095). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is initially noted Claims 23-25 and 35 have been canceled, rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claims 23-25 and 35 moot. Claim 28 has been amended to add reference to “unitary” in reference to the masses and to depend from new Claim 38. Claims 28 and 38 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 28. Claim 36 has been amended to delete reference to “conductive” with respect to the sheath and to depend from new Claim 39. Claims 36 and 39 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 36.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 26, 27, 29-34 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims. Claims 26, 29, 30 and 37 have been herein canceled. The limitations of Claim 26 have been included in new

Claim 38. The limitations of Claim 34 have been included in new Claim 39. Claims 27, 31, 33 and 34 have been amended to depend from new Claim 38.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2005

By: 
Thomas J. Krul, Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/TJK/mmk